

## REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections contained in the Office Action of August 28, 2007 is respectfully requested.

By this Amendment, claims 1 and 2 have been amended. Thus, claims 1-4 are currently pending in the application. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3-4 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-2 of U.S. Patent No. 7,261,917. In this regard, it is noted that a terminal disclaimer has been filed, under separate cover, along with this amendment. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the double patenting rejection of claims 3-4 has been rendered moot in view of the submission of a terminal disclaimer.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kawamura et al. (JP 2003-183650). For the reasons discussed below, it is respectfully submitted that the amended claims are clearly patentable over the prior art of record.

Amended independent claim 1 recites a plasma display device comprising a plasma display panel in which a plurality of discharge cells are arranged, and in which a phosphor layer in a color corresponding to each discharge cell is disposed. Claim 1 also recites that the phosphor layer has a green phosphor layer including a green phosphor made of  $Zn_2SiO_4:Mn$  *processed by calcinations in an atmosphere including at least one of  $N_2$ ,  $N_2-O_2$  or  $Ar-O_2$  at a pressure not less than 0.105 MPa and not greater than 150 MPa*, with the green phosphor having an even density extending from a surface to an inside of the green phosphor. In addition, claim 1 recites that the green phosphor has an element ratio of zinc to silicon of 2/1, which is a stoichiometric ratio, at a portion which includes a proximity of the surface of the green phosphor.

Amended independent claim 2 recites a plasma display device comprising a plasma display panel in which a plurality of discharge cells are arranged, and in which a phosphor layer in a color corresponding to each discharge cell is disposed. Claim 2 also recites that the phosphor layer has a green phosphor layer including a green phosphor made of  $Zn_2SiO_4:Mn$  *processed by calcinations in an atmosphere including at least one of  $N_2$ ,  $N_2-O_2$  or  $Ar-O_2$  at a*

*pressure not less than 0.105 MPa and not greater than 150 MPa, with the green phosphor having an even density extending from a surface to an inside of the green phosphor. In addition, claim 2 recites that the green phosphor has an element ratio of zinc to silicon equal to a stoichiometric ratio at a portion which includes a proximity of the surface of the green phosphor, and that the green phosphor is positively charged or zero-charged.*

Kawamura discloses a method for producing a plasma display apparatus in order to prevent deterioration of luminance in a phosphor layer. However, Kawamura does not disclose a green phosphor layer including a green phosphor made of  $\text{Zn}_2\text{SiO}_4\text{:Mn}$  *processed by calcinations in an atmosphere including at least one of  $\text{N}_2$ ,  $\text{N}_2\text{-O}_2$  or  $\text{Ar-O}_2$  at a pressure not less than 0.105 MPa and not greater than 150 MPa*, as required by independent claims 1 and 2. Rather, Kawamura only discloses that a green phosphor composed of  $\text{Zn}_2\text{SiO}_4\text{:Mn}$  in which the charged state is changed to zero or positive homogenously forms a phosphor layer, and does not disclose a green phosphor layer including a green phosphor made of  $\text{Zn}_2\text{SiO}_4\text{:Mn}$  *processed by calcinations in an atmosphere including at least one of  $\text{N}_2$ ,  $\text{N}_2\text{-O}_2$  or  $\text{Ar-O}_2$  at a pressure not less than 0.105 MPa and not greater than 150 MPa*, as required by independent claims 1 and 2.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1-4 are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is clearly in condition for allowance. An early notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

If, after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner feels there are any issues remaining which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Yuichiro MIYAMAE et al.

By: Walter C. Pledger  
Walter C. Pledger  
Registration No. 55,540  
Attorney for Applicants

WCP/lkd  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
November 28, 2007